

REMARKS

Reconsideration of the application in view of the above amendments and the following remarks is respectfully requested.

The Examiner states that FIGURE 11 should be designated by a legend such as -- prior art -- because only that which is old is illustrated. A replacement sheet is enclosed herewith in which this figure has been so labeled.

The Examiner objects to the drawings under 37 C. F. R. 1.83(a) because they failed to show a third constant current source circuit connected in series with the third diode between the first port and the gate terminal of the first MOS transistor as called for in Claim 12 and a fourth constant current circuit called for in Claim 15.

It is respectfully submitted that no new drawings are required. FIGURE 9 illustrates three constant current sources 20, 28 and 80 as well as a diode 36 connected as recited in Claim 12. Claim 15 has been cancelled without prejudice.

The Examiner rejects Claims 3 and 6 – 21 under 35 U. S. C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards to the invention. The Examiner states that in Claim 3, the recitation of “a first switch” is indefinite because it fails to provide the connection of the first switch and the recitation of the “first clamping circuit” lacks proper antecedent basis. Claim 3 has been amended to recite that the first clamping circuit comprises a first switch, which should overcome both rejections.

The Examiner states that in Claim 6, the recitation of “a second clamping circuit” lacks proper antecedent basis. Although, Applicant's see no reason why the “second clamping circuit” could not have been claimed in a claim which is not dependent from a claim reciting the first clamping circuit, Applicant's have amended Claim 6 to be dependent upon Claim 3, which should obviate the Examiner's rejection.

The Examiner states that in Claim 7 the recitation of "a second switch" is indefinite because it fails to provide the connection for the second switch and the recitation of "the second switch" in line 2 lacks proper antecedent basis because no first switch is recited in Claim 1 or Claim 6. Claim 7 has been amended to recite that the second clamping circuit comprises a second switch and Claim 6, from which Claim 7 depends, is now dependent upon Claim 5 and indirectly dependent upon Claim 3, which does recite a first switch.

The Examiner states that in Claim 10, the recitation of a "third diode" lacks proper antecedent basis because no first or second diode is recited in Claim 1. Claim 10 is dependent upon Claim 8 and indirectly on Claim 4, where the first and second diodes are recited.

The Examiner states that in Claim 12, the recitation of "a third current source" in line 2 lack proper antecedent basis because there is no first or second current source recited in Claim 10 or Claim 1. Claim 12 is indirectly dependent upon Claims 5 and 9 which recite first and second current sources. The Examiner states that recitation of a third constant current source connected in series with the third diode between a first port and a gate terminal of the first MOS transistor is indefinite because it is misdescriptive. The Examiner states that FIGURE 1 shows two current sources 20 and 28 but they are not connected as claimed. The Examiner states that clarification is required. This rejection is respectfully traversed. As stated above, the three constant current sources and the third diode are shown in FIGURE 9.

The Examiner states that in Claim 13, the fourth diode lacks proper antecedent basis because no first, second or third diodes are recited in Claim 1. Claim 13 is now dependent upon Claim 11 and therefore, indirectly dependent upon Claims 4, 8 and 10 which recite the first, second and third diodes, respectively.

The Examiner states that in Claim 14 the recitation of a second resistor lacks proper antecedent basis because no first resistor is recited in Claim 13. Claim 13 is now dependent upon Claim 11 which does recite the first resistor.

The Examiner states that in Claim 15 the recitation of a fourth constant current source lacks proper antecedent basis. This Claim has been cancelled without prejudice.

The Examiner states that in Claim 16, the recitation of a fifth diode in line 2 lacks proper antecedent basis because no first, second, third or fourth diodes are recited in Claim 1. Claim 16 is dependent upon Claim 13 and therefore, recites these diodes in the chain of claims.

The Examiner states that in Claim 17, the recitation of a third switch and a fourth switch lacks proper antecedent basis because there are no first or second switches recited in Claim 1 or Claim 16. This Claim is indirectly dependent upon Claims 3 and 7, which recite the first and second switches.

The Examiner states that in Claim 20, the recitation of a sixth diode, a fifth switch and a sixth switch lacks proper antecedent basis. This has been overcome by making Claim 20 dependent upon Claim 17.

The Examiner rejects Claims 1-2 and 6 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by McDaniel. Claim 1 has been amended to recite that a voltage transition at the first port from substantially a reference voltage to a first voltage is coupled to the gate of the first transistor by the gate to first terminal capacitance to switch the mode of operation of the level shifting circuits to clamp the gate voltage of the first transistor. This feature is not shown or suggested by McDaniel. Claim 2 is dependent upon Claim 1 and is therefore patentable for the same reasons. Claim 6 is dependent upon Claim 3, which should now be in condition for allowance, since the Examiner found it to be allowable if rewritten to overcome the '112 rejection. A new Claim 25 has been added which corresponds to Claim 6 but dependent upon Claim 1, as amended. This Claim is patentable for the same reasons that Claim 1 is patentable.

The Examiner rejects Claims 10-12 with a 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over McDaniel. These claims are indirectly dependent upon Claim 3. The Examiner having found Claim 3 to be allowable if rewritten to overcome the '112 rejection should make these claims patentable as well.

The Examiner allowed Claims 22-24, objected to Claims 4-5 and found Claims 3, 7-9 and 13-21 would be allowable if rewritten to overcome the '112 rejections and include all limitations to the base Claim and any intervening claims.

According, Applicants believe the Application, as amended, is in condition for allowance, and such action is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

Texas Instruments Incorporated

By 
William B. Kempler
Senior Corporate Patent Counsel
Reg. No. 28,228
(972) 917-5452